

REMARKS

I. INTRODUCTION

Claims 1 and 10 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Thus, claims 1-12, 14, 15 and 17-20 remain pending in the present application. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable.

II. THE 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) REJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claims 1-12, 14, 15 and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Loughmiller, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,914,605 (hereinafter “Loughmiller”), in view of Arakawa et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,297,051 (hereinafter “Arakawa”). (See 9/12/07 Office Action, p. 2).

The Examiner admits that Loughmiller fails to disclose the recitation of “the orientation of the text label is flipped to ensure it remains upright when the text label one of approaches vertical, reaches vertical, and passes vertical.” However, the Examiner cites Arakawa to purportedly cure this deficiency. (See 9/12/07 Office Action, p. 3).

Claims 1 and 10 have been amended to recite “an orientation of each character within the text label remaining constant with respect to other characters in the text label as the text label is flipped.” In contrast, Arakawa discloses a method of displaying a text label such that each character, within the text label, will remain vertical in the display. (See Arakawa, Figs. 5-9.) For example, comparing Fig. 5 with Fig. 6 of Arakawa, upon a 90-degree rotation of the map, each character in the text label “ROUTE1” is repositioned so that the characters are stacked one on top of the other such that each character remains vertical in the display. Thus, in Arakawa the orientations of each of the characters of the text label are repositioned with respect to each other. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Arakawa does not disclose or suggest “an orientation of each character within the text label remaining constant with respect to other characters in the text label as the text label is flipped,” as recited in claims 1 and 10.

Applicants further submit that Loughmiller does not cure the above-described deficiency of Arakawa with respect to claims 1 and 10. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner should withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of claims 1 and 10. As claims 2-9, 14, 15 and 19 depend from, and therefore include all the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons given for claim 1. As claims 11, 12, 17, 18 and 20 depend from, and therefore include all the limitations of claim 10, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons given for claim 10.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Please direct all future correspondence to:

Paul Im, Esq.
IP Counsel

Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9602
Fax: (914) 332-0615
Email: paul.im@philips.com

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 4, 2007

By: 
Michael J. Marcin (Reg. No. 48,198)

Fay Kaplun & Marcin, LLP
150 Broadway, Suite 702
New York, NY 10038
Phone: 212-619-6000
Fax: 212-619-0276